



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 30, 2022

Ms. Stephanie Berry  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Denton  
215 East McKinney Street  
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2022-36953

Dear Ms. Berry:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 986208 (CAO File No. R001416-090222).

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified address. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The city states information pertaining to incident number 22122345 relates to a closed criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the city did not timely raise its claim under section 552.130 of the Government Code in accordance with section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). However, because section 552.130 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301, we will consider the applicability of section 552.130 of the Government Code to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

deferred adjudication. Based on this representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information pertaining to incident number 22122345 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own confidential information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and this information may not be withheld from him under common-law privacy. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the date of birth it marked from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. Nevertheless, upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information. Further, as we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information pertaining to incident number 22122345 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>3</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Colin Henry  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CEH/pt

Ref: ID# 986208

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup> We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.